



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mouth,⁶ although the immediate source is unquestionably John de Trevisa's translation of Ralph Higden's *Polychronicon*, which had been published by Caxton in 1482, and remains even to the present day the least rare of Caxton's printings.⁷

The theory of Mr. Fleay as to the identity of the three plays *Valteger*, "*Henges*" and *The Mayor of Queenborough* is altogether probable from the important rôles played by the usurper and the Saxon chief in *The Mayor*. From the following circumstance we may consider the identification as certain.

In 1846 Collier printed for the Shakespeare Society the interlude *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom*, to which he added certain "Early Illustrations of Shakespeare and the English Drama." The second of these "illustrations" is entitled "Curious Dramatic Manuscript," and runs in part as follows:

"Understanding that there existed in the library of an ancient family in the East of England an early MS. containing plays by Beaumont and Fletcher, I made further inquiries, and was favored with a sight of the volume. It is of no great antiquity, but may furnish important readings."⁸

Five plays are then mentioned which do not concern us here. The sixth is *Hengist King of Kent* and fortunately for us Collier took the trouble to transcribe the prologue, which runs as follows:

Raynulp[h]. What Raynulp[h] Munk of Chester can
 Raise from his Polichronicron,
 That raised him, as works doe men,
 (To see light so long parted with agen)
 That best may please this round faire ring 5
 With sparkleing judgments circled in
 Shall produce, if all my power[s]
 Can wyn the grace of too poore howres:
 Well apaide I goe to rest,
 Ancient storyes have bene best, 10
 Fashions that are now called ner
 Have bene worne by more then you;
 Elder times have us'd ye same,
 Though these new ones get ye name,
 So in story whats now told 15
 That takes not part with days of old?
 Then to prove times mutuall glorye
 Ioyne new times love to old times storye, *Exit*.

These eighteen lines, save for a few trifling variants, form the prologue to *The Mayor of*

⁶ *Historia Regum Britanniae*, translation ed. Giles, 1842, p. 111 ff.

⁷ The Story of Vortigern is told at some length in the *Polychronicon* Book v. *Chronicles and Memorials of Great Britain*, Higden, 5, 255-277.

⁸ *Shakespeare Society Publications*, 1846, p. 85.

Queenborough as printed in the works of Middleton, a fact of which Collier was evidently unaware, and which apparently Mr. Bullen did not know in editing his—the latest—edition of Middleton. As the variants are several of them such as to require the transcription of more than one line, I also transcribe the prologue in the version of Mr. Bullen's edition.

Ray. What Raynulp[h], monk of Chester can
 Raise from his Polychronicron,
 That *raiseth* him, as works do men,
 To see *long-parted light agen*,
 That best may please this round fair ring,
 With sparkling *diamonds* circled in,
 I shall produce. If all my *powers*
 Can win the grace of two poor hours,
 Well apaid I go to rest.
 Ancient stories have been best;
 Fashions, that are now call'd new,
 Have been worn by more than you;
 Elder times have used the same,
 Though these new ones get the name:
 So in story *what* now told
 That takes not part with days of old?
 Then to *approve* time's mutual glory,
 Join new time's love to old time's story.⁹

The italics indicate variants from the text given by Collier and are, as they stand, sufficient to show that Mr. Bullen's is a later version. It would be interesting to learn what has become of the manuscript, the whereabouts of which Collier so vaguely indicated, as it contained besides two well known plays of Fletcher's Sir William Barclay's *The Lost Lady*, published in 1638, *The Inconstant Lady* by Arthur Wilson, who died in 1652, and *The Lovers' Hospital*, of which I can find no mention elsewhere. It may be added that Mr. Fleay says that Wilson's play was published in 1814, although a MS. of it is supposed to have been destroyed by Warburton's cook.¹⁰

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE OLDEST SCENES IN GOETHE'S FAUST.

I.

In its general outlines, the evolution of Goethe's *Faust*—from those early days when, as the poet recalls in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, "die Puppenspielfabel klang und summt gar vieltönig in mir wieder," to the closing months of his life, when he put the last touches to the Second

⁹ Bullen's *Middleton*, 2, 5.

¹⁰ *Chronicle of the English Drama*, 2, 278.

Part—has long been familiar to us, but it is only within recent years that the first chapter of the history of *Faust*, namely that on its origin and earliest stages, has had something more than hypotheses to deal with. Attempts to establish a chronology for Goethe's work on *Faust* in the period before he left Frankfurt for Weimar towards the end of 1775, date virtually from Wilhelm Scherer's papers in *Aus Goethes Frühzeit (Quellen und Forschungen*, 34, Strassburg 1879), and the same critic's *Betrachtungen über Goethes Faust (Goethe-Jahrb. 6* [1885], 231 ff., reprinted in *Aufsätze über Goethe*, Berlin 1886, 293 ff.)—papers which for long were held up as warning examples of the abuse of the philological method. The tendency, however, of recent criticism of *Faust* is to go back to Scherer, or, at least, to show a better appreciation for the valuable side of Scherer's work on *Faust*.¹ A new basis for the whole subject was afforded by E. Schmidt's important discovery in 1887 of the Göchhausen MS. of the pre-Weimarian *Faust*, the so-called *Urf Faust (Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt*, nach der Göchhausenschen Abschrift herausgegeben von E. Schmidt. 1-4. Abdruck. Weimar 1887-99). On this new basis the most important, or at least, the most voluminous contribution to the study of *Faust* is J. Collin's *Goethes Faust in seiner ältesten Gestalt* (Frankfurt a. M., 1896). The chronological deductions of Collin's work are unfortunately its weakest side; they are too obviously based on an *a priori* theory that *Faust* in its first stage was wholly written in 1774 and 1775:

der älteste Faust ist anzusehen als das Produkt einer nach jahrelanger innerer Arbeit rasch und kräftig hervorbrechenden dichterischen Tätigkeit (p. 122).

Cf. O. Pniower's review in the *Anzeiger für deutsches Alterthum*, 24 (1898), 382 ff., and a paper comparing Collin's standpoint with Scherer's by S. W. Cutting in MOD. LANG. NOTES, 10 (1895), 464 ff. Among the ablest and most penetrating critics of the *Urf Faust* is Otto Pniower, to whose numerous contributions repeated reference will be made in the following pages; the most important of these is the volume which he published a few months ago

¹ Cp. Prof. Calvin Thomas's paper on *Scherer's Methods as a Critic of Faust* in the *Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America*, 2 (1887), 92 ff.

under the title *Goethes Faust: Zeugnisse und Excursus zu seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Berlin: 1899), an indispensable handbook for every student of *Faust*. In 1897 J. Niejahr came forward in partial support of Scherer's standpoint with an article in *Euphorion*, which in turn called forth a new philological investigation of the opening monologue by F. Saran in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*. Saran also supports in the main Scherer's conclusions with regard to the construction of this monologue. These papers, to which I shall have occasion to add several others in the course of the present article, give a general idea of the attitude of recent *Faust-Forschung* to the question of the "oldest *Faust*." A summary of the whole controversy is to be found in the introduction to Schmidt's edition of the Göchhausen MS., which in the two last editions has become a veritable introduction to the entire subject of *Faust* Philology. Prof. Schmidt's own standpoint is in the main a conservative one; as far as chronology is concerned, it is summed up in the words: *Faust-dichtung vor 1773 oder erst 1774 ist wiederum nur im Bereiche der Gedanken, nicht der gestaltenden Ausführung zu suchen* (p. xiii). The object of the present paper is, on the basis of these recent developments of *Faust* criticism, to suggest some kind of working hypothesis of the actual beginnings of Goethe's masterpiece.

II.

Prof. Schmidt's view is virtually that to which we are led by the direct evidence bearing on the origin of Goethe's *Faust*. Leaving aside all evidence which only proves in a general way that Goethe was engaged on the poem in 1775—a fact which was, of course, established by the discovery of the Göchhausen *Faust*—we might conveniently arrange the remaining evidence in three groups.

I. Contemporary Evidence. a. Gotter's lines to Goethe (in Pniower's list [*Goethes Faust*, Berlin 1899] No. 7):

Schick mir dafür den Doktor Faust,
Sobald Dein Kopf ihn ausgebraust!

which point to the date Summer 1773. This date is corroborated by the letter in the *Italienische Reise*, dated March 1, 1788 (Pniower, No. 56), in which Goethe refers to his plan of writing *Faust* fifteen years before. b. Boie's

statement of October 15, 1774 (Pniower, No. 12): *Sein Dr. Faust ist fast fertig, und scheint mir das grösste und eigenthümlichste von Allem.* c. Knebel's letter of December 23, 1774, to Bertuch (Pniower, No. 13): *Ich habe einen Haufen Fragmente von ihm, unter andern zu einem Doctor Faust, wo ganz ausnehmend herrliche Scenen sind.*

II. The second group of evidence dates from the years 1811-13: it is that of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* and of the plans and sketches connected with that work. a. In Book ten of *Dichtung und Wahrheit* (Werke, 27, 320) Goethe connects the origin of *Faust* with his friendship with Herder in Strassburg (September 1770-April 1771), but at the same time states that nothing was written then (Pniower, No. 3). b. In a sketch of the contents of Books 9-11 (probably dictated April 2, 1811) are the words, referring to the latter part of his 'sojourn in Strassburg, (Pniower, No. 4): *Fortsetzung der übrigen Natur- und Medicinischen Studien. Unendliche Zerstreuung. Vorbild zum Schüler in Faust* (Werke, 28, 360). c. In Book twelve (Werke, 28, 98) Goethe discusses his visit to Darmstadt in the spring of 1772 and refers to *Faust* as being then in an advanced condition (see, however, Pniower, No. 5). To this group of evidence might be added; d. Jacobi's letter to Goethe of April 12, 1791 (Pniower, No. 79): *Von Faust kannte ich beynahe schon alles . . . Wie ich vor sechzehn Jahren fühlte . . .* Jacobi was a guest of the Goethe family in January, and again at the beginning of March, 1774.

III. The third, and naturally least trustworthy group of evidence, is that of Goethe's correspondence and conversations in the last years of his life. a. In a letter to Zelter of May 11, 1820 Goethe associates the composition of an important part of *Faust* with *Satyros* and *Prometheus* (Pniower, N. 326). b. In a conversation with Eckermann (February 10, 1829) he connected *Faust* with *Werther* (Pniower, No. 692), and again c. in the *Annalen* it is mentioned along with the *Puppenspiele* and the *Prolog zu Bahrdr* (Pniower, No. 2). To these items has also to be added d. the statement, doubtless based on some authority, of Eckermann and Riemer, ascribing *die ältesten Scenen des Faust* to the years 1773-74 (Pniower, No. 9). In later life Goethe was thus clearly

inclined to date the origin of the poem earlier than our direct evidence justifies us in dating it. This is also seen in e. the letter to Zelter of June 1, 1831, in which he speaks of having conceived *Faust* in his twentieth year (that is, 1769) (Pniower, No. 874), and again, f. in the letter to W. von Humboldt of March 17, 1832, in which he speaks of his occupation with *Faust* extending over more than sixty years (that is, at least to 1771).

Of internal evidence, the influence of Herder's *Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* (published at Easter, 1774) on ll. 72 ff. of the *Urfaust* (Pniower, No. 10) is the only fact sufficiently well established to afford a date for any part of the poem earlier than 1775. Thus, as far as actual proofs are concerned, we are forced to the conclusion that *Faust* may have been begun in 1773, but that we have complete certainty only for the years 1774 and 1775.

III.

The question as to when Goethe began *Faust*, and what are the oldest scenes in the drama, is, however, by no means so easily disposed of. Even if we ignore completely—which we are hardly justified in doing—the second and third groups of evidence, the poem is still of too composite a nature to have been written off, as it stands in the Göchhausen MS., between 1773 and 1775. That MS. certainly does not represent the earliest form of the *Faust* poem any more than it contains all of the poem that Goethe brought with him to Weimar (see O. Pniower, *Zwei Probleme des Urfaust*, in *Vierteljahrschrift f. Littgesch.*, 2 [1889], 146 ff. and R. Kögel, *Der vorweimarische Faust*, in the same volume, 545 ff.). Evidence such as that which Collin (*loc. cit.*) brings forward to support his theory that the *Urfaust* was written off as it stands, in 1774-75, proves no more than that Goethe was too good a poet not to weave his older plans and materials skillfully into the new whole.

There can hardly be any question that the oldest part of Goethe's *Faust* is the opening monologue; here, if anywhere, must have been the beginning of the drama (cf. E. Schmidt, *Urfaust*, p. xxxv). B. Seuffert (*Die älteste Scene im Faust* in the *Vjs. f. Littg.* 4 [1891], 339 ff.) attempted to claim the "Mephistopheles Student" scene as a parody written in

Leipzig. But just as there could have been no Faust without the opening monologue, so there could have been no Mephistopheles without Faust. And this opening monologue, as Scherer first suggested, and as has recently received confirmation from J. Niejahr (*Kritische Untersuchungen zu Goethes Faust: I. Älteste Gestalt*, in *Euphorion*, 4 (1897), 272 ff.) and F. Saran (*Die Einheit des ersten Faustmonologs* in the *Zeitschr. f. deut. Phil.* 30 [1898], 508 ff.), is no homogeneous whole. That there is a break of plan just before Faust opens the book of Nostradamus is, I think, no longer open to question. Scherer placed the break after line 74; Saran with more probability places it after l. 72, regarding the four lines

73-76: Umsonst dass trocknes Sinnen hier
Die heiligen Zeichen dir erklärt
Ihr schwebt ihr Geister neben mir
Antwortet mir wenn ihr mich hört.

as the transition to the later plan, according to which Faust conjures the spirit, not in the open country, but in his own room. We may not feel justified in seeing with Niejahr traces of an originally out-of-door scene in the present *Erdgeist* scene, but there is little doubt that Goethe's original intention was to make Faust evoke the *Erdgeist* in the open country. Hardly less convincing seems to me the first break which Scherer insisted upon; namely, that between the matter-of-fact beginning of the monologue and the poetic, Swedenborgian (see M. Morris, *Swedenborg im Faust*, in *Euphorion*, 6 [1899], 491 ff.) apostrophe to the moon:

33 ff: O sthest du voller Mondenschein . . .

It would be absurd, of course, to say (cf. Schmidt, *l. c.*, p. xxviii) that a poet of Goethe's genius could not have written even the whole opening monologue of *Faust* with all its varied tones, and that in a single day, but the question has to be considered in view of the fact that the first scene of the *Urfaust* falls naturally into two parts, one of which is uniformly pervaded by a pantheistic conception of nature, by a constant antithesis of nature and spirit, while the other is in a tone of dry, cynical humor. The lines of the monologue which are completely free from this Herder-Swedenborgian spirit are obviously 1-28, not 1-32, for the last four lines of the first section of the monologue,

29-32: Dass ich erkenne was die Welt
Im innersten zusammenhält
Schau alle Wirkungskraft und Saamen
Und thu nicht mehr in Worten kramen.

besides simply enlarging on the preceding lines, have already a touch of what I should call the new spirit; and again, the lines descriptive of Faust's *Mauerloch* (45-56). Apart from the fact that these latter lines are in the same tone as the first twenty-eight lines, it is worth noticing that the description they give of the *enges gothisches Zimmer* is not imagined for a night scene when the room is so dimly lighted that the moonlight pours into it, and the details of its furnishings would not be visible, but for daylight,

47-48: Wo selbst das liebe Himmels Licht
Trüb durch gemahlte Scheiben bricht.

The superscription *Nacht* of the scene is probably to be associated with the lines 33 ff. I would thus claim as all that remains to us of the earliest stage of Faust's monologue, ll. 1-28, then, after a gap, ll. 45-56. In addition to these forty lines, ll. 65-68,

Flieh! Auf! hinaus in's weite Land!
Und dies geheimnisvolle Buch
Von Nostradamus eign' Hand
Ist dir das nicht Geleitz genug?

and the last four lines of the scene (165-168), which form the transition to the *Faust-Wagner* scene, were perhaps also taken over from the first rough sketch of the drama.

The next scene of the *Urfaust*, that between Faust and Wagner, belongs to the oldest scheme of the drama. There was a Wagner in one of the *Puppenspiele*. The satiric tone of the scene stands out in sharp contrast to the spirit of the *Erdgeist* scene, and certainly harmonizes better with that part of the monologue which I have claimed as oldest. At the same time, as R. Huther (*Herder im Faust*, in *Zeits. f. deut. Phil.* 21 [1889], 329 ff.) has pointed out, the influence of Herder permeates the scene, although it is surely unnecessary to go to Herder's *Provinzialblätter* for parallelisms. This part of *Faust* has not yet been subjected to the careful philological scrutiny to which the foregoing and the succeeding scenes have been subjected, but I doubt if much would be gained by such an investigation. As the scene stands, it has a poetic justification owing to the contrast it affords to the *Erdgeist* scene, but it seems to me more than probable that it was

written before the spirit-conjuring scene, and was intended to precede them. The latter, as originally planned, would, of course, have demanded a change of scene, while the *Faust-Wagner* scene could only have taken place in Faust's room. Faust's interview with the *Erdgeist*, to mention another small point, would have hardly suggested itself to Wagner as *deklamieren*: it points rather to the scene having been immediately preceded by the original monologue.

And upon this *Faust-Wagner* scene follows in the Göchhausen *Faust* the scene between Mephistopheles and the Student, incontestably one of the oldest elements in the poem. As we have seen, it has even been claimed as dating back to Goethe's sojourn in Leipzig, but as E. Schmidt has with justice pointed out (*loc. cit.* p. xlii), the tone of the verses would not have been approved of by the Leipzig Goethe. On the other hand, Leipzig memories are fresh in it; the figure of the young *Fuchs* receiving advice about food and lodgings seems more likely a Leipzig reminiscence than a Strassburg one. That, however, Goethe's Strassburg experience had much to do with the scene is to be inferred from the words, already quoted, in a sketch plan for his autobiography: *Vorbild zum Schüler in Faust*. Pniower (*Die Schülerszene im Urfaust*, in *Vjs. f. Littg.* 4 [1891], 317 ff.) has subjected this scene to a searching and, in the main, convincing analysis, with the result that he distinguishes in it two parts, the first consisting of lines 249-338, the second of the last one hundred and three lines (341-444), the two parts being loosely connected by the verses

339-340: Ihr seyd da auf der rechten Spur,

Doch müsst ihr euch nicht zerstreuen lassen.

The first of these parts Pniower ascribes to the winter of 1771-72, the second to 1775.

The position of the *Auerbachs Keller* scene in the chronology of *Faust* is less easy to determine. Its vivid Leipzig memories and associations might lead us to find here, as in the preceding scene, an early Leipzig constituent of the poem. This theory—which B. Seuffert (*Vjs. f. Littg.* 1 [1888], 53 ff.) attempted to maintain, but afterwards rejected—is however, indefensible. As the scene stands, it could certainly not have been written in Leipzig. At the same time, the immediateness of its de-

scriptions and its local color point strongly to the fact that it was sketched while Goethe's Leipzig memories were still fresh. In a letter to Auguste von Stolberg of September 17, 1775, Goethe wrote (Pniower, No. 21): *ich machte eine Scene an meinem Faust*, and in the same letter, a few lines later, compared himself to a *Ratte, die Gift gefressen hat*. This has generally been accepted as giving a clue to the date of this scene. Another and slighter piece of evidence, is the resemblance between a verse which Goethe wrote in his Diary on June 15, 1775, and the lines at the beginning of the scene,

179-180: Uns ist gar kannibalsch wohl
Als wie fünfhundert Säuen!

(Pniower, No. 20.) But as Pniower (*l.c.*) has shown, there is no reason why this and the *Ratte* song should not have been later additions. For that part, the evidence, however strong, that Goethe was engaged on "*Auerbachs Keller*" at all when he wrote to Auguste von Stolberg, is by no means conclusive. The academic freshness and specifically Leipzig color of the scene is, I think, strongly in favor of the hypothesis that "*Auerbachs Keller*" in some shape formed a constituent part of the oldest *Faust*.

IV.

To sum up the conclusions which, it seems to me, we are justified in drawing as to the oldest form of Goethe's *Faust*: 1) There is no ground for assuming that Goethe had written a line about Faust before the winter of 1771-72; at least, if he had, nothing of it had passed into the *Urfaust* as we know it from the Göchhausen MS. But in Leipzig Goethe's thoughts had at least been directed to the magician Faust (cf. the references to Faust in the *Mitschuldigen*: Pniower, No. 1); the real *Auerbachs Keller*, with its pictures of the saga, had brought Faust visibly before him, and Lessing's fragment (1759) had suggested the literary possibilities of the theme. In 1769 his interest in alchemy probably again brought Faust near to him. But we may accept his own statement in *Dichtung und Wahrheit* as the true one, that nothing was written on *Faust* until after his acquaintance with Herder, until his return from Strassburg to Frankfort in 1771. The fact that Goethe's earliest verses in the

Knittel rhythm of Hans Sachs^a belong to this year is additional evidence that it is the earliest date to which we can ascribe work on *Faust*. To the winter of 1771-72 belongs then, it seems to me, the oldest form of the *Faust* poem; this oldest form was what might be described as a purely academic *Faust* on the basis of the puppet-play. In addition to the evidence of detail I would emphasize, on one hand, the vividness of the academic scenes, which precludes too long a separation from Goethe's own experiences in Leipzig and Strassburg; on the other hand, the manifest changes of aim and plan, not to speak of the changes in poetic style, which demanded a separation, not of months, but of years, between the earliest form and the later additions.

This oldest academic *Faust* opened with a monologue of which I have specified how much seems to me to have passed over into the Göchhausen version. Upon this first scene—which may have included a spirit-conjuring scene, but was more probably a monologue and nothing more—followed the *Faust-Wagner* scene. The third scene of the fragment embraced the first half of the *Mephistopheles-Student* scene. As a fourth scene, there may have been an early form of the *Auerbachs Keller* scene, but it was probably only a roughly sketched-out plan, which took clearer form later, when Goethe had a better idea of what he intended to do with *Faust* after bringing him and *Mephistopheles* together. It is very improbable that any of the *Gretchen* scenes existed before the year 1774; it is quite out of the question that Goethe had even dreamt of making his *Faust* the hero of a love tragedy as early as the winter of 1771-72.

JOHN G. ROBERTSON.

University of Strassburg, Germany.

NOTES ON ENGLISH VOWELS.

I. Gradation in 'year' and other Nouns.

WE are accustomed to the process of modern gradation (German *ablaut*) in particles, pronouns, and some verbs, for example, *be*, *have*, *can*, etc. In substantives and adjectives it is not so obvious and for that very reason deserves attention. In *histor'ical*/*his tery*/*his'*-

^a *Werke*, iv, 2, 9, in an epistle to Merk. Cf. Pniower in *Vjs. f. Littg.* 4 (1891), 333.

l'ry les'son, and in *hick'ery*/*hick''ry nut'* we have a gradation series with *o/e/zero*. In *ārt'*/*artis'tic*, as in OE. *ān'*/*an*, we have an *ā/a* series, which in early modern English 'on(e) feather'/'birds of a feather' appears as *ō/a*, just as the Indo-European series *ā/a* appears as *ō/a* in Germanic. In *day/holiday/Monday* we have the series *ē/e/i*. The same series is found also in words in *-ate*. Verbs of this class, being generally followed by a weak syllable (see *Publications of the M. L. A. of A.* xii, 322), have considerable stress on the *a*, which thus appears as *ē*, for example, *separate* and so *separated*. The same is true of substantives and adjectives that frequently stand at the end of a sentence (see my *German Orthography and Phonology*, § 278, a), for example, *vulgate*, *mandate*, *cognate*, *prostrate*, etc. But adjectives that are usually used attributively, and so stand before a syllable with heavy stress, have *e* or *i*, for example, *separate*, *delicate*, etc., and so most substantives of two syllables: *senate*, *pirate*, *prelate*, *frigate*, *palate*, etc.; those having a weak syllable before the *-ate* vary between *ē* and *e*, for example, *candidate*, *reprobate*, *aggregate*, *certificate*. Here belong also the cases of lengthening in open syllables provided not more than one syllable follows, and the cases of shortening if more than one syllable follows (see Luick, *Anglia*, xx, 337 ff.); to the examples given by Luick we may add ME. *vīne*/*vinegre*, *āker*/*akerspire* (see column 283), and *Mary* with *ē*/*Maryland* with modern shortening of *ē* to *e*. The cases of *æ > ē > ā/æ*, for example, in *päss*/*pæssage* and *pæssenger*, *bāth*/*Kätherine*, *photogrāph*/*photographic*, I shall deal with in another paper.

My chief object in calling attention to modern gradation in nouns is to explain the present diversity in the pronunciation of *year*. This word has two pronunciations, one with long *i* (more or less low before the *r*) and one with long *æ*. The first, which rhymes with *fear*, is almost universal in America, the second, which rhymes with *her*, is getting the upperhand in England. This difference of vowel is due to gradation, the strong form generally maintaining itself with us, and the old weak form crowding it out in England and parts of eastern New England.